

Message

From: Barnett, Felicia [Barnett.Felicia@epa.gov]
Sent: 8/18/2017 11:56:55 AM
To: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Subject: RE: Parcel B next. Then Parcel G RE: Next week I will request PCA analysis of more survey units

Lily:

FYI, to let you know where we are with the funding on Hunter's Point:

As of the end of June, we finished nearly spending all the original funding amount. So the billing for July starts the use of the \$50K funding. I have not seen the hours for July but they should be in next week. I can let you know how much has been spent up until the end of July when that happens if you like.

Thank you.

Felicia Barnett, Director
ORD Site Characterization and Monitoring Technical Support Center (SCMTSC)
Superfund and Technology Liaison, Region 4
USEPA
61 Forsyth Street
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 562-8659

From: Anita Singh [mailto:asingh428@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2017 5:50 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Cc: Barnett, Felicia <Barnett.Felicia@epa.gov>; donna.j.getty <donna.j.getty@leidos.com>
Subject: Re: Parcel B next. Then Parcel G RE: Next week I will request PCA analysis of more survey units

Dear Lily,

Please clarify if should we ask Melissa to format Parcel B and Parcel G data?

Thanks.

Anita

On Thu, Aug 17, 2017 at 2:33 PM, LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@epa.gov> wrote:

Dear Anita,

Thank you! I will request some more Parcel C survey units and also some in Parcel B next week. I hope early the following week (e.g. 8/28-29 or so) to be able to request some individual survey units for Parcel G. Probably most in G, fewer in C, and least in B.

I appreciate your working with Donna and Melissa.

Lily

From: Anita Singh [mailto:asingh428@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2017 2:25 PM

To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>

Cc: Barnett, Felicia <Barnett.Felicia@epa.gov>; donna.j.getty <donna.j.getty@leidos.com>; Anita Singh <asingh428@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Next week I will request PCA analysis of more survey units

Dear Lily,

We will be available to address you statistical needs for all items listed in your email above.

I have a question - survey units/trench units that you would like us to evaluate belong to which Parcel.

We have Parcel C data in format suitable to perform multivariate PCA evaluations.

However - if survey units are from parcels B or G or some other area - data pre-processing will be required.

Melissa of EPA in Region 2 did a great job last time. She can do that again.

Donna is very proficient in processing of Excel files.

If Melissa is not available - I am sure Donna will be available to covert Fred files in format for multivariate evaluations.

Please advise.

Thanks.

Anita

On Thu, Aug 17, 2017 at 2:04 PM, LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@epa.gov> wrote:

Dear Felicia,

Thank you for the work that Leidos has done so of PCA analysis. I wanted to let you know that probably next Wed I will give a list of more survey units where I will request PCA analysis. If I can do it earlier I will. It will be good if you could give me the results as they become complete rather than waiting for all of them to be done before giving me. That way we can keep the process moving. I don't yet know how many I will request. Probably 5-10 or so. The consultants should already have the spreadsheets with the Navy's data from the FRED database. But let me know if that is not available.

In addition, the Navy is scheduling a meeting to propose their approach on Buildings 9/12. It will likely be 10-4 Pacific Time or something like that, with a lunch break. I would like to request that statisticians attend that meeting by phone to the extent they are available.

For background context for the review, below is a summary of findings thus far by the Navy's contractor. I would appreciate review by the statistician of this below.

In addition, I am working on a spreadsheet that more details of allegations of Tetra Tech EC, Inc., falsification, which I hope to send next Monday. I would also like to ask the statisticians to read that for background context so they will be aware of more areas to look for in the statistical analysis. .

Thank you for your help!

- Lily

-----Original Message-----

From: Brooks, George P CIV [<mailto:george.brooks@navy.mil>]
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2017 12:43 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Subject: RE: Status Update - TtEC Radiological Data Evaluation

Lily, here is a summary I provided to our management. I updated it a little bit (to include Parcel D-2, and the chain-of-custody allegation/investigation)

In October 2012, RASO project managers noted anomalies in the reported results from soil samples in Parcel E. A subsequent investigation revealed evidence that confirmation soil samples represented as originating at survey units in Parcels C and E had been replaced with soil collected from another area. Tetra Tech EC (TtEC) resampled these areas and performed additional remediation in some cases. A report summarizing the events was published in April 2014, at which time the scope of data manipulation appeared to be small, and isolated to a few individuals.

In 2016 and 2017, former TtEC employees and subcontractors made public allegations that data manipulation was more widespread than indicated in the 2014 report, and that data manipulation was conducted in a number of different ways. At least eight types of alleged fraud were identified by former workers:

- 1) Fake sampling, in which soil samples - potentially thousands of them - were reported to have been taken at one location when they were actually taken from another;
- 2) Altering building scan data records by copying data from one survey unit to another survey unit;
- 3) Conducting false building scan surveys by allowing the scanner detector to remain stationary;
- 4) Remediating radioactive material in soil improperly, resulting in potentially radiologically-contaminated soil being used as backfill for trenches at the Shipyard or sent to disposal facilities unlicensed to receive low level radioactive waste (LLRW);
- 5) Discarding samples and analytical results if the results were above the cleanup level;
- 6) Altering individual data to make them appear more acceptable; and
- 7) Altering Portal Monitor procedures so radiologically-contaminated soil was potentially allowed to be shipped offsite for disposal in a non-LLRW disposal facility.
- 8) Chain-of-custody form manipulation

The Navy's began to investigate the validity of all TtEC radiological data in late 2016. The shipyard is divided into Parcels, B, C, D, D-1, D-2, G, E, E2, UC-1, UC-2, and UC-3. All of the Parcel B soil and building scan data have been examined along with subsets of soil data from Parcels C, UC-1, UC-2, and UC-3. The Navy's preliminary conclusions are listed below based on allegations from former workers.

- 1) The Navy has confirmed additional instances where confirmation soil samples represented to be from one location were actually collected at another location.

- 2) The Navy has concluded that some building scan data was compromised by allowing the scanning equipment detector to remain stationary while collecting data (area scanning did not occur).
- 3) Six buildings have been investigated and the Navy found several examples in two of the buildings where hundreds of lines of data were copied from one survey unit and pasted into the scanning record of another survey unit.
- 4) Evidence has been found documenting improper remediation at the screening pads (replacement of soil samples).
- 5) The Navy has not found evidence to date that samples and their elevated analytical results were discarded.
- 6) Evidence has not been found that TtEC changed individual data points to make them appear more acceptable. However, the Navy has requested from TtEC and is awaiting receipt of the raw data files from the scanning equipment. Comparing the raw data with the formatted database is one method to identify this type of data manipulation.
- 7) Investigation is ongoing regarding allegations of improper portal monitor operation.
- 8) Chain-of-custody forms are being reviewed and the different types of manipulation are being noted and summarized. This process has just begun and results are not yet available.

It is thought that the early radiological work, which was conducted at Parcel B, would have the fewest instances of data manipulation and fraud. All of the Parcel B data have been examined. As the Navy's evaluation considers other Parcels, it is likely that the rate of data manipulation will increase until its initial discovery in 2012. More evaluation is needed to determine whether falsification occurred after 2012.

Please let me know if you need specific information regarding the number or types of instances where we have discovered data manipulation since beginning this project. Thanks, Pat

George (Patrick) Brooks, PG

Environmental Business Line Team Leader

Hunters Point, Treasure Island, Tustin, El Toro and San Diego NTC

Navy BRAC PMO West

33000 Nixie Way

Bldg 50

San Diego CA 92147

619-524-5724 (office)

619-322-1866 (cell)

Lily Lee

Cleanup Project Manager

Superfund Division

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)

San Francisco, CA 94105

Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518

For information on Superfund in general: www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

For information on Hunters Point Naval Shipyard: www.epa.gov/superfund/hunterspoint

--

Anita Singh

--

Anita Singh